## **United States Court of Appeals**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-3427		
Chinles Name	*	
Shirley Novak,	*	
D1-1-4:65 A114	*	
Plaintiff-Appellant,	*	
v.	*	
<b>v</b> .	*	
American Heyer-Schulte Corporation,	*	
formerly known as Heyer-Schulte	*	
Corporation, a Delaware Corporation;	*	
American Hospital Supply Corporation,	*	
an Illinois Corporation;	*	
1 ,	*	
Defendants,	*	
	*	
Baxter Healthcare Corporation, a	*	Appeals from the United States
Delaware Corporation; Baxter	*	District Court for the District
International, Inc., a Delaware	*	of Nebraska.
Corporation;	*	
	*	[UNPUBLISHED]
Defendants-Appellees,	*	
	*	
XYZ Corporation, 1-10,	*	
	*	
Defendant	*	

	No. 98-3433	
Lacinda Geer,		×
		*
	Appellant,	k
		*
V.		k k
American Heyer-Schulte Corporation, formerly known as Heyer-Schulte Corporation, A Delaware Corporation; American Hospital Supply Corporation, An Illinois Corporation; Baxter Healthcare Corporation, A Delaware Corporation; Baxter International, Inc., A Delaware Corporation; XYZ Corporation, 1-10,		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
	Appellees.	k
	No. 98-3451	
Carla Love,		×
,		×
	Appellant,	*
		k
v.		k k
American U	eyer-Schulte Corporation,	*
	own as Heyer-Schulte	*

Corporation, A Delaware Corporation;

American Hospital Supply Corporation, \*
An Illinois Corporation; Baxter \*
Healthcare Corporation, A Delaware \*
Corporation; Baxter International, Inc., \*
A Delaware Corporation; XYZ \*
Corporation, 1-10, \*

Appellees. \*

Submitted: December 13, 1999

Filed: January 10, 2000

\_\_\_\_\_

Before MURPHY, JOHN R. GIBSON, and FAGG, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM.

Shirley Novak, Lacinda Geer, and Carla Love (collectively the appellants) appeal the district court's adverse grants of summary judgment in their product liability actions for personal injuries they suffered when they received silicon gel breast implants manufactured by American Heyer-Schulte Corporation. In reviewing the appellants' claims, the district court held Novak's and Geer's claims were barred by Nebraska's statutes of limitations and repose, Love's claim was barred by Texas's statute of limitations, and the district court also rejected the appellants' defenses to the statutes of limitations and repose. We review a grant of summary judgment under a well-established standard. Because this is a diversity action, we review de novo questions of state law. Having considered the record and the parties briefs, we are satisfied the district court correctly applied the controlling state law and the record supports the district court's rulings. We also conclude a comprehensive opinion in this diversity case would lack precedential value. We thus affirm on the basis of the district court's rulings without further discussion. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

JOHN R. GIBSON, Circuit Judge, concurs in the result and in the judgment in this case.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.